

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed November 10, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on August 22, 2006 and July 7, 2008.

A further Information Disclosure Statement was submitted on January 13, 2011, and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10 and 13 have been amended to better recite the features of the present. Accordingly, claims 1-16 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 1-8, 10, 12 and 13 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action rejects claim 1 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0032213 to Yonezawa and U.S. Patent No. 4,695,859 to Guha. The Official Action rejects claims 2, 3, 10 and 11 as obvious based on Yonezawa. The Official Action rejects claim 5 as obvious based on the combination of Yonezawa, Guha, and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0149119 to Kumatani. The Official Action rejects claims 6, 7, 13 and 14 as obvious based on the combination of Yonezawa and Kumatani. The Official Action rejects claims 4, 12 and 15 as obvious based on the combination of Yonezawa, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0052324 to Kimura and U.S. Patent No. 6,590, 633 to Nishi. The Official Action rejects claim 8 as obvious based on the combination of Yonezawa, Kimura, Nishi and Kumatani. The Official Action rejects claims 9 and 16 as obvious based on the combination of Yonezawa, Kumatani, and U.S. Publication No. 2004/0152392 to Nakamura. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections because the Official Action has not made a *prima facie* case of

obviousness and/or that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2144.04, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some reason to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

With respect to independent claims 1-3, 5-7, 10 and 13, these claims are amended in order to clarify novel features of the claims including "wherein the integrated circuit includes a power supply circuit configured to generate a power supply voltage by using from an alternating voltage generated by the antenna." Support for this feature can be found, for example, in Applicant's specification on page 2, lines 19-27. No new matter is added. The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended.

The Official Action alleges that Yonezawa teaches "wherein the integrated circuit 421 includes a power supply circuit (Fig. 21, element Vi) configured to generate a power supply voltage (Para. 233) by using an alternating voltage generated by the antenna 2708." The Response to Arguments section of the Official Action then further asserts

that Applicant admitted that Yonezawa has a power supply line (Vi) and that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the power supply line has to connect to the power supply circuit in order to get power. From this, it is apparently concluded that Yonezawa teaches the claimed feature. Applicant continues to respectfully disagree with the conclusions made in the Official Action.

The above statements made in the Official Action, even if true, do not address any connection between the alleged antenna 2708 in the cell phone example in Yonezawa and the alleged power supply line (Vi) that would have enabled the power supply circuit to be configured to generate a power supply voltage "from an alternating voltage generated by an antenna," as now better clarified in the claims. Otherwise, if this were the case, a cell phone would not require a separate battery source. The various secondary references fail to overcome the deficiencies of Yonezawa with respect to independent claims 1-3, 5-7, 10 and 11.

Because Yonezawa, alone or in view of secondary references, does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained with respect to independent claims 1-3, 5-7, 10 and 13. Therefore, Applicant believes the rejections of claims 1-3, 5-7, 10 and 13 and claims dependent therefrom are not proper.

Regarding independent claims 4, 8 and 12, these claims recite "a rectification circuit configured to rectify an alternating voltage generated by an antenna." In support of this feature, the Official Action again relies on teachings of Yonezawa, in particular, antenna 2708 and power supply line (Vi). For reasons discussed above with respect to the other independent claims, the Patent Office has not established any connection between the alleged antenna 2708 and any rectification circuit in Yonezawa that would have been configured to rectify an alternating voltage generated by the antenna, or generate a power supply voltage from voltage outputted from the rectification circuit. The various secondary references fail to overcome the deficiencies of Yonezawa with respect to independent claims 4, 8 and 12.

Because Yonezawa, alone or in view of secondary references, does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained with respect to independent claims 4, 8 and 12. Therefore, Applicant believes the rejections of claims 4, 8 and 12 and claims dependent therefrom are not proper.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(a), 1.20(b), 1.20(c), and 1.20(d) (except the Issue Fee) which may be required now or hereafter, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2280.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
3975 Fair Ridge Drive,
Suite 20 North
Fairfax, Virginia 22033
(571) 434-6789